

very recently, though after two years consideration, reversed the verdict and ordered a new trial, all because text-books etc., were introduced in the trial, and these, the court holds, are hearsay evidence and should not be admitted. So the weary work is to be gone over again. The trouble and anxiety, to say nothing of the thousands of dollars already spent, count for nothing; the courts will allow the imposition to continue and require the spending of more thousands of dollars. Here is food for thought. We are becoming a strong organization and certainly possess a large potential strength. Can it not be exerted? Should there not be some much-needed legislation, when conditions are such as to permit this sort of thing to continue? The medical profession is regarded as legitimate prey by certain elements in the community, and if the doctor has any property, if he is worth suing, the slightest imaginary pretext—or no pretext at all—is taken on which to base what is called a “mal-practice suit,” but what is really a hold-up. The vast majority of such suits are filed with the idea that the victim will compromise; often he does. But Dr. Kreutzmann is not of that stuff; he has fought the suit, and will fight it to a finish. The JOURNAL would suggest to the Committee on Legislation that here is material ready to its hand.

Careful examination of the suit against Dr. Kreutzmann and the facts recorded in its connection, fails to reveal the slightest ground for the plaintiff's contention.

UNJUST ATTACK. The patient was examined and diagnosis of ovarian cyst made. Six months later she was again examined, the tumor existed, and operation was decided upon. The abdomen open, it was found that the uterus was enlarged and presented a fecund appearance. Pregnancy could not be positively excluded, so the abdomen was closed and nothing further was done. Six months later, one of the witnesses testified, the tumor was reduced in size and the patient very much improved. At the trial she was the picture of health and had recovered from that for which she sought relief in the first instance. Yet in spite of these facts, the suit went forward and reputable physicians permitted themselves to appear and testify against the defendant. It is alleged that personal feeling, or, rather, ill-feeling actuated some of the witnesses for the plaintiff. Of this we have no knowledge, but if it is the case, it seems to the JOURNAL that the Society should step in and protect its members from such unjust attacks. The final consideration always should be the net result to the patient; if the patient is improved by what the physician has done or has not done, he is certainly justified in his judgment. The whole life experience of the doctor is made up of exercise of judgment, and if

his acts are in the main right, or if the results of his acts are to the benefit of the patient, he should be protected by his fellow-practitioners. He who attempts to injure a brother practitioner, unjustly attacked, often injures himself more than the defendant. We, as a Society, certainly should stand for harmony, coöperation and protection of ourselves and of each other.

“The registration of all dairies” is the first in the list of desiderata suggested by the Department of Agriculture in its pamphlet on the “Milk Supply of 200 Cities.” The second suggestion is that there should be “Official indorsement of properly conducted dairies.” It is to be noted that there is no suggestion of attacking the bad dairies; the fact seems to be recognized that better results may be brought about by commending the good thing than by striking at the bad thing. All the suggestions are most excellent, as applied to milk; they are equally excellent as applied to drugs and medicines, which are notoriously in a demoralized condition. As things stand now, anyone except a doctor and a druggist may on the one hand prescribe, and on the other sell and prescribe, drugs and medicines, with safety from legal interference. Any old rascal, charlatan or ignoramus may make up what he pleases, call it what he will, and delude whom he may into thinking it what it probably is not—something good, useful or to be prescribed. He may (and does) make “official” preparations from worthless material, as the reports of state and national committees on adulteration have been showing for years. He may do this with perfect safety, for he is under no legal restraint nor control, nor is he responsible to anyone for those he kills or allows to die under the administration of his worthless stuff. Why not go beyond the milk stage and apply a little of the principle of “registration” and “official indorsement” to those things that are at least as important in the conservation of human life as is milk? Why not say that the worthless 90 per cent of crude drugs imported into this country to be made up into medicines for “home consumption” shall find some other consumers? Some day we shall wake up.

ANOTHER OPINION ON ADVERTISING.

This JOURNAL, in its February number, quoted the editor of the *St. Louis Medical and Surgical Journal* as saying, anent the advertisements of “proprietary medicines”: “We have many, and hope to get more.”

There must be some definite relation which an editor bears to his subscribers, and a definite way in which he thinks of them. This is necessary, for he has, in some way, to please them to keep their